



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,137	11/18/2003	Hae Young Kim	29239-190105	1911
26694	7590	11/30/2007		
VENABLE LLP				
P.O. BOX 34385				
WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998				
EXAMINER				
CARTER, CANDICE D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
4127				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/30/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/715,137

Applicant(s)

KIM, HAE YOUNG

Examiner

Candice D. Carter

Art Unit

4127

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/18/03.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-85/86)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/27/2004
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Inventor's Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is a First Action Non-Final on the merits. Claims 1-18, as originally filed, are currently pending and have been considered below.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 2 and 3 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 2 recites the term "on" when it seems that the applicant intended to recite the term "one". Examiner is interpreting the claim as such. Claim 3 recites the term "ate" when it seems that the applicant intended to recite the term "at". Examiner is interpreting the claim as such. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-7, 9-11, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wenger (US 2003/0233242).

As per claim 1, Wenger discloses "A system accessible by a user for planning and tracking certification, comprising:

planner that generates one or more certification goals based on a user profile and an authority profile associated with a certification authority" (Pg. 6, ¶ 89; via users select the school they want to profile their transcript against. The analysis provides a

profile that details overall credits required to complete the program, where transcript information is stored in the users profile/account and the program information is taken from school profiles and the credits to be competed for the program are the certification goals)

“wherein the planner is responsive to user selection of one or more of the generated certification goals for creating a certification plan” (pg. 6, ¶ 89; via users select the school they want to profile their transcript against. They can elect to have their transcript profiled against School/Program or Equivalency data or License programs);

“and a tracker that updates the certification plan in response to input regarding achievement of the one or more selected certification goals” (pg. 4, ¶ 31; via tracks credits achieved through training or portfolio processes).

As per claim 2, Wenger discloses “the certification plan relates to at least one of certification, re-certification, licensing, re-licensing in a field of endeavor” (Abstract; via licensure programs).

As per claim 3, Wenger discloses “the field of endeavor comprises a field relating to at least one of education, teaching, medical, engineering, legal, accounting, and sports” (pg. 1, ¶ 6; via teaching, engineering and nursing).

As per claim 4, Wenger discloses “the certification authority comprises at least one of a federal government, state government, county government, local government, municipal government, public official, private official, governmental agency, non-

governmental agency, public institution, and private institution” (pg. 3, ¶ 25; via Profiling for schools, where schools could be public or private institutions).

As per claim 5, Wenger discloses, “the planner is responsive to at least one of Needs Assessment and Certification Credit information for generating the certification” (pg 4, ¶ 37 and 38; via In order to support auditing directions for program and license analysis information pertinent to a particular curriculum or program is stored in containers. The system is able to take information from the containers to develop career/program plans for each user).

As per claim 6, Wenger discloses “the planner is responsive to certification credit transfer from another certification authority for generating the certification goals” (pg. 3, ¶ 21; via determine possible transfer credit awards)

As per claim 7, Wenger discloses “the tracker updates the certification plan based on at least one of a user input and non-user input” (pg. 6, ¶ 88; via users can modify transcript information as additional courses are taken, employment changes or new information becomes available where this information is tracked by the credit tracking feature discussed in ¶ 30).

As per claim 9, Wenger discloses “certification resource generator that associates at least one of the certification goals with at least one certification resource” (pg. 3, ¶ 26; via presents requirements for degrees at the school for a specific program of study and/or a specific licensure program where the degree requirements are associated with the program of study that the user wishes to study and are also the certification goals that must be completed in order to receive certification or a degree).

As per claim 10, Wenger discloses "the certification resource comprise at least one of a course, program, session, seminar, audio lecture, video lecture, a book, a test, and a form" (pg. 4, ¶ 30; via credit could be awarded for military courses or experience through ACE courses, CLEP tests, SAT/ACT tests, or Portfolio reviews).

As per claim 11, Wenger discloses, "has a format comprising at least one of a course, session, seminar, degree program, test, form, book, audio, and video" (pg. 4, ¶ 30; via credit could be awarded for military courses or experience through ACE courses, CLEP tests, SAT/ACT tests, or Portfolio reviews).

As per claim 13, Wenger discloses, "including an on-line system accessible by the user for at least one receiving, ordering, and registering for a certification resource" (pg. 3, ¶ 22; via Online training Systems that provide training services for the Portfolio Development System, Career Plain Training and Employment Skills training).

As per claim 14, Wenger discloses, "wherein the planner transmits the certification plan to the certification authority for approval" (pg. 6, ¶ 87; via Program managers manage and maintain information about schools, courses and equivalencies. When possible, updates to these databases are completed electronically. Partner schools can access these files. They update their information several times a year and verify accuracy of program, course, and equivalency databases, where the verification is the approval by the certification authority).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 8, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wenger as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Orton et al. (US 2003/0046265).

As per claim 8, Wenger discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose “the planner prioritizes the generated certification goals based on one or more certification requirements of the certification authority”. Orton et al. discloses a method and system for creating personalized training programs having a planner that “prioritizes the generated certification goals based on one or more certification requirements of the certification authority” (pg. 5, ¶ 69; via The tool tracks the progress of the user throughout the training plan. The tool keeps the user apprised of his/her progress. Once the user completes the requested training modules, he/ she is ready to attend the scheduled learning lab, where the system prioritizes the program such that the user will complete the training modules before they attend the learning lab).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and system for auditing academic credit for employment and training of Wenger to include the step of “prioritizing the generated certification goals based on one or more certification requirements of the certification authority” as taught by Orton et al. because prioritizing

the certification goals for the user will ensure that the user is successfully completing the program requirements as required by the certification authority.

As per claim 15, Wenger discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose “the tracker transmits an e-mail to the user in connection with a certification goal”. Orton et al. discloses a method and system for creating personalized training programs having a planner having a “tracker transmits an e-mail to the user in connection with a certification goal” (pg. 1, ¶ 8; via receive, automatic email alerts relating to new and existing resources according to the user’s interests and career plans).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and system for auditing academic credit for employment and training of Wenger to include where “the tracker transmits an e-mail to the user in connection with a certification goal” as taught by Orton et al. because alerting the user by email will ensure that the user receives all information pertinent to their certification goals.

As per claim 16, Wenger discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose “the tracker alerts the user regarding a certification goal deadline”. Orton et al. discloses a method and system for creating personalized training programs having a planner having a “tracker that alerts the user regarding a certification goal deadline” (pg. 4, ¶ 35; via the tool will display an approximate time for completion of the questions so that the user may accommodate this time, where the time for completion of the questions is a deadline).

6. Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wenger as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Finaid.org (2002).

As per claim 17, Wenger discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose "an on-line grant module accessible by the user to search for a grant". Finaid.org discloses a scholarship database system having "an on-line grant module accessible by the user to search for a grant" (§ 5; via search one of the scholarship databases, where a scholarship is a grant).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and system for auditing academic credit for employment and training of Wenger to include the searchable scholarship database system as taught by Finaid.org because students may need funding for school, and a provision that would allow them to search for such funding would be a useful feature for the claimed system.

As per claim 18, Wenger discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose, "the on-line grant module allows the user to apply for a selected grant". Finaid.org discloses a scholarship database system having where "the on-line grant module allows the user to apply for a selected grant" (§ 4; via you can even submit an application to some of the scholarships listed).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and system for auditing academic credit for employment and training of Wenger to include the searchable scholarship application database system as taught by Finaid.org because students may

need funding for school, and a provision that would allow them to search and apply for such funding would be a useful feature for the claimed system).

7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wenger as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Examiners Official Notice.

As per claim 12, Wenger discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose "wherein the course comprises at least one of a live course and a self-paced course".

Examiner takes Official Notice that all courses can only be, either, live or self paced. For example, a student may register for different types of courses such that they can fit into their schedule. These courses may be live courses that meet 2-4 times a week in a lecture hall or a lab with faculty facilitation, or they may be taken online where course materials and requirements may be reviewed and completed at the students' convenience. Courses may also be taken through software programs, which also allow students complete them at their own pace.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and system for auditing academic credit for employment and training of Wenger to include live and self-paced courses, since such is old and well known in the art that all courses are always, either, live or self-paced courses.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. L'allier et al. (6,606,480) discloses an automated system and method for creating an individualized learning program. Anneswamy et al. (US 2004/0096811) discloses a computer-assisted system for designing training programs. Burmester et al. (6,561,812) discloses a system and method of correlating learning materials with educational objectives.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Candice D. Carter whose telephone number is (571) 270-5105. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:30-5:00) with First Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynda Jasmin can be reached on (572) 272-3033. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Elaine Gort/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3627

CDC

